



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

am here in London worse off than most of my American *confrères*, for, being unable to subscribe to them all, I am dependent on the British Museum, where, as is well known, the numbers are not obtainable immediately after their appearance, but often as much as five or six months later. As an instance, I might mention that when I asked last July for the January and February numbers of your *Notes*, the last number on the shelves was June, 1905.

When I was in Paris in December last, I collated the ms. 1428 with Potvin's text. I also found the first branch of the prose-Perceval in a late fourteenth century manuscript, viz., No. 119 (anc. 6790), ff. 520<sup>a</sup>-522<sup>a</sup>, where it forms a sort of introduction to the vulgate *queste*, occupying ff. 522<sup>a</sup>-564<sup>a</sup>.

H. OSKAR SOMMER.

#### THE FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATOR OF WIELAND'S *Oberon*.

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS :—In an article in the December number of *Modern Language Notes* on "Graf Friedrich von Stolberg in England," Mr. George M. Baker suggests the possibility that the James Six who translated two odes of Stolberg's was also the author of a pamphlet entitled "The Construction and Use of a Thermometer. By James Six, Esq., F. R. S." The author of this pamphlet and the translator of the odes were father and son, as the introduction to the former's essay shows. James Six, senior, died in 1793, and in the following year a friend published the article on the thermometer. To a brief account, in the preface, of the life of Six, Sr., he appended the following extract from the *Gentleman's Magazine* in regard to Six, Jr., who died at Rome in 1786 at the age of twenty-nine.

"He was a young man of great natural abilities, and of extensive learning. He understood the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, and German languages, and in most, if not all of them, had a well-grounded and accurate knowledge; . . . . Two beautiful odes . . . translated from the German, give no mean idea of his poetical powers; . . . He was the son of Mr. James Six, of Canterbury, to whose ingenious observations and experiments in natural philosophy, &c., the public have been much indebted. (*Gentleman's Magazine* for January, 1787.)"

Besides the two odes already mentioned, James Six, Jr., also translated Wieland's *Oberon*, but only a few stanzas of this appeared in the *Deutsches Museum* for 1784 (Vol. II, pp. 232-47); the rest

was never published, mainly because of Wieland's objections to any translation of the poem into a foreign language. Wieland expressed himself very favorably, however, in regard to the stanzas which he had seen of Six's English version of the *Oberon*.

In a letter to Eschenburg of the 25th of March and another of the 7th of May, 1784 (given in Schnorr's *Archiv*, XIII, pp. 503-6), Wieland explains his reasons for not wishing the *Oberon* translated.

W. A. COLWELL.

*Harvard University.*

#### THE NORTH-ENGLISH HOMILY COLLECTION.

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS :—I should like to call the attention of your readers to a connection which I have just discovered between the Anglo-French poem entitled the *Miroir* or *Les evangiles des domeés* and the *North-English Homily Collection*. The French work was written by Robert of Gretham, about 1250 (see P. Meyer, *Romania*, xv, 296 ff.), and contained a series of metrical homilies for every Sunday in the year. Five manuscripts of the complete poem or of the illustrative narratives have been described (see Varnhagen, *Zts. f. rom. Phil.* I, 541-545; Bonnard, *Les traductions de la bible en vers français*, 1884, pp. 194 f.; P. Meyer, *Romania*, VII, 345, xv, 296-305), but all are in a more or less fragmentary state. The same author probably wrote another homiletic poem called the *Corset*, preserved in ms. Douce 210. What is perhaps a fragment of the *Miroir* in some redaction has recently been printed in *Romania*, xxxv, 63-67, by M. Meyer.

The Northern cycle of Middle-English homilies has hitherto been considered an independent compilation. It was written in the early part of the fourteenth century and exists in numerous manuscripts (see Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden, Neue Folge*, 1881, LVII-LXXXIX, and my *North-English Homily Collection*, 1902), of which only the Edinburgh ms. has as yet been published (Small, *English Metrical Homilies*, 1862). In the progress of preparing an edition of the work for the E. E. T. S. I have for some years been inclined to believe that an Old French original for at least part of the collection must have existed; but until recently I had no proof. By a study of the fragments of Robert of Gretham's poem, which have been printed by the gentlemen who have described the still unpublished manuscripts of that work, I have now made up my mind that it is the source of at least a considerable portion of the English collec-

tion. A measure of originality will nevertheless be left, I believe, to the Northern writer. The evidence of relationship, the details of which I must beg to be excused from giving till I make a personal study of Robert's entire poem next summer, rests upon similarity of arrangement, upon translation of certain passages almost line by line, and upon what seems to be an allusion of the translator to his original. It is needless to add that this relationship, if I succeed in establishing it, will place the interesting Northern cycle in a somewhat different position from that which it has hitherto occupied. For the present, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that all available evidence points in one direction.

G. H. GEROULD.

Princeton University.

#### A RECIPE FOR EPILEPSY.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The following interesting recipe for epilepsy is found in a breviary of the thirteenth century in the library of Vendome. After having copied it, I discovered that attention had already been called to it in the catalogue of manuscripts under the No. 17. However, it is worth repeating as a curiosity:

*Jaspar fert aurum, thus Melchior, Baltasar (corr. Astrapa) mirram;*

*Hec quicumque trium secum fert nomina regum  
Solvitur a morbo Christi pietate caduco.*

J. L. GERIG.

Columbia University.

#### *Beowulf* 62.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Though deeply conscious that Professor Klaeber and I have cruelly overworked l. 62 of *Beowulf*—and through it probably our friends as well—I am not yet content to remain quiet. It is Professor Klaeber's extended letter in the December *Modern Language Notes* that now moves me, and I beg the space for a few words in reply. I am not seeking here to add new arguments, nor to restate old ones, nor even to bolster up any of those I have put forward in the past. Nothing of the sort seems to me necessary. It may be I am like the battered youngster who gets up protesting he is unhurt. At least, in spite of all the articles and learning Professor Klaeber has marshalled against me, I cannot see that a single one of my conclusions has been seriously damaged. Only once, I believe, has he even touched upon my chief line of argument,

when he cites against me a few parallel cases of a genitive in *-as* and a nominative feminine singular in *-a*; but surely a half dozen such cases drawn from all Old English literature does not prove the forms to be normal, nor disprove my statement that "after the word *cwen* everything is peculiar." He has not shown that there was any mistake before *elan*, nor has he proved that there was any real correction made after *cwen*.

I might very well stop with this self-confident protestation that I feel entirely uninjured, if Professor Klaeber had not used against me some questionable tactics (I hope the phrase is not offensive). That is, in the first place, Professor Klaeber has persisted in seeing things in the autotype that surely are not there. In one article he thought the erasure might have been for a blot of ink. I showed that conjecture to be very ill-founded<sup>1</sup> and then turned the argument against him,—for his hypothesis was really favoring my position. Now he thinks the erased word may have been *þawæs*, but anyone who looks at a good copy of the autotype can see that this second conjecture is equally untenable. There is not the slightest trace of a *þ* or a *w*. And I may add, again his hypothesis favors my position. Now I must confess that I think it unkind of Professor Klaeber to entice me with phantoms that for my side have such fair seeming show.

Another point on which I feel I have cause to be aggrieved—though I am not, of course—is Professor Klaeber's treatment of the *hyrde* case in *Fat. Ap.* 70. The first time he referred to the passage he gave the wrong line-number and now, alas, he has misquoted the line itself, making things look very dark for me. It is not *hyrde ic*, as Professor Klaeber states, but *hyrde we*, and the parallelism to *Beowulf* is accordingly not nearly so close as the misquotation would seem to show. In fact, I cannot see that the line contains a parallel at all.

There are other points in Professor Klaeber's letter that might be discussed, but no matter. The subject is evidently too small for either of us to distinguish himself in, and I for one shall be glad to drop it. In closing, however, may I add that I do not think Professor Klaeber has done full justice to the brilliancy and ingenuity of Professor Abbott's proposed emendation *Hroðulfes wæs*. I am not championing the emendation, nevertheless I think it has several strong points in its favor, and that these have been put forward with great skill. The explanation offered as to how the error arose seems to me especially brilliant, and very much better than Professor Klaeber's similar treatment.

FRANK E. BRYANT.

University of Kansas.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Vol. xxi, p. 145.